UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

| STEVEN E. GREER |) | |
|---|-------------|--|
| Plaintiff, |))) | Current Case No. 2:24-cv-01237-SDM-CMV |
| v. |) | |
| SUSAN HARRELD, MICHAEL HARRELD Sr., SARAH CONROY GREER, EDWARD BRYAN GREER, CYNTHIA HALL, |))))) | |
| Defendants, |) | |
| | | |

NOTICE OF FILING

Plaintiff provides this Notice of Filing of an Order from the 6^{th} Cir. on the writ of mandamus (24-3779) for a reasoned decision from the district court Order denying sanctions. The 6^{th} Cir. Order is silent on the merits (i.e., is a court required to file a reasoned decision?). It did state:

FRCP Greer may not use the writ "as a substitute for the regular appeals process." Cheney, 542 U.S. at 380–81. If Greer is correct that denying the motion without written reasoning was an abuse of discretion, Int'l Union, UAW v. Aguirre, 410 F.3d 297, 304 (6th Cir. 2005) (recognizing that we review Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 sanctions decisions for an abuse of discretion), this court will be able to identify and remedy that abuse. Because direct appeal in the ordinary course is an adequate alternative, Greer is not entitled to mandamus relief.

An eventual 6^{th} Cir. order, after appeal, to vacate and remand is likely. This Court has the authority to revise the Order (ECF 62).

Dated April 25, 2025

/s/ Steven E. Greer By: Steven E. Greer, pro se steve@greerjournal.com (212) 945-7252 No. 24-3779

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED Apr 25, 2025 KELLY L. STEPHENS, Clerk

| In re: STEVEN ERIC GREER, |) | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| |) | <u>O R D E R</u> |
| Petitioner. |) | |

Before: SUTTON, Chief Judge; COLE and CLAY, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiff Steven Eric Greer petitions for a writ of mandamus directing the district court to issue a reasoned decision explaining why it denied Greer's motion to sanction Defendants Christopher Tackett and Robert Dunn and their law firm in this diversity suit. He also moves to expedite consideration.

Mandamus "is a 'drastic and extraordinary' remedy 'reserved for really extraordinary causes." *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004) (quoting *Ex parte Fahey*, 332 U.S. 258, 259–60 (1947)). "As the writ is one of the most potent weapons in the judicial arsenal, three conditions must be satisfied before it may issue," beginning with there being "no other adequate means to attain the relief [Petitioner] desires." *Id.* at 380-81 (cleaned up). Greer's petition fails at this threshold inquiry. Contrary to his assertion that there are no other remedies, "[t]he denial of sanctions will be reviewable following entry of final judgment on the merits in the underlying dispute." *Haskell v. Wash. Twp.*, 891 F.2d 132, 133 (6th Cir. 1989) (order). Greer may not use the writ "as a substitute for the regular appeals process." *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 380–81. If Greer is correct that denying the motion without written reasoning was an abuse of discretion, *Int'l Union*, *UAW v. Aguirre*, 410 F.3d 297, 304 (6th Cir. 2005) (recognizing that we review Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 sanctions decisions for an abuse of discretion), this court will be able to identify

Case: 2:24-0\(\frac{2374-\\$10749}{25/252-\\$2/24-0\(\frac{2374-\\$10749}{25/252-\\$2/24-0\(\frac{2374-\\$2/24-0\(\frac

No. 24-3779

-2-

and remedy that abuse. Because direct appeal in the ordinary course is an adequate alternative, Greer is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Denying Greer's mandamus petition renders his motion to expedite moot. *See Sullivan v. Benningfield*, 920 F.3d 401, 410 (6th Cir. 2019).

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

Kelly L. Stephens, Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

Kelly L. Stephens Clerk 100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540 POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000 www.ca6.uscourts.gov

Filed: April 25, 2025

Mr. Steven Eric Greer 7029 Maidstone Drive Port Saint Lucie, FL 34986

Re: Case No. 24-3779, *In re: Steven Greer* Originating Case No. : 2:24-cv-01237

Dear Sir,

The Court issued the enclosed (Order/Opinion) today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Roy G. Ford Case Manager Direct Dial No. 513-564-7016

cc: Mr. Richard W. Nagel

Enclosure

No mandate to issue